



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

fw

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/915,703	07/26/2001	Byeung-Joon Ahn	P/2292-46	9357

2352 7590 02/13/2003
OSTROLENK FABER GERB & SOFFEN
1180 AVENUE OF THE AMERICAS
NEW YORK, NY 100368403

EXAMINER
CIRIC, LJILJANA V

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3743	

DATE MAILED: 02/13/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Interview Summary	Application No. 09/915,703	Applicant(s) Ahn
	Examiner Ljiljana V. Ceric	Art Unit 3743

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Ljiljana V. Ceric

(3) _____

(2) Max Moskowitz, Reg. No. 30,576

(4) _____

Date of Interview Feb 11, 2003

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
c) Personal [copy is given to 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No. If yes, brief description:

Claim(s) discussed: 1, 13-16, 20-22 (only generally with respect to the prior art applied thereto)

Identification of prior art discussed:

U.S. Patent No. 6,076,253 (of record), issued to Takayama et al. on Jun 20, 2000.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Attorney Moskowitz telephoned Examiner Ceric to inquire regarding the rejection of claims 1, 13-16, and 20-22 as being anticipated under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) by Takayama et al. as cited in the previous Office action, Paper No. 5. More specifically, he asked which of the two Takayama et al. references listed on the PTO-892 is being referred to in the aforementioned rejection. Examiner Ceric responded that all references listed on the PTO-892 form are listed thereon in the order in which these are referenced in the corresponding Office action, and that the first reference to Takayama et al. (see prior art listing above) listed on the PTO-892 form is thus the reference referred to in paragraph 11 of the previous Office action. Attorney Moskowitz also asked why the aforementioned rejection was not made under 35 U.S.C. 102 (e) instead of under 35 U.S.C. 102 (b); Examiner Ceric referred Attorney Moskowitz to 37 CFR 1.55 and to MPEP 201.15, as well as to paragraph 12 of the previous Office action.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached

LJILJANA V. CIRIC
PRIMARY EXAMINER
ART UNIT 3743

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.


Examiner's signature, if required